

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,725,425 to Rajan *et al.* (hereinafter “Rajan”).

II. Summary of Applicants’ Amendment

Claim 1, and various dependent claims that depend from claim 1 are amended. Claims 2, 5-8, and 11-25 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of claims 2, 5-8, and 11-25 in one or more continuation or divisional applications. Claims 26-39 are added. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 3-4, and 9-10, and newly added claims 26-39 is found, for example, at pages 6-9; page 11, line 23 to page 18, line 9; and page 25, line 20 to page 27, line 5 of the present application, and in the original claims.

III. Applicants’ Amendment

Claim 1, as presently amended (underlines and strikethroughs removed), recites:

1. A method for managing content resources in a network, comprising:
receiving a subscription request from a user, the subscription request specifying at least one content resource to be presented to the user through the network;
determining that the user is authorized for access to the at least one content resource by use of the user’s Internet Protocol (IP) address;
determining at least one quality of service required for presenting the at least one content resource to the user; and
providing, for the user, at least one communication channel in the network with the determined at least one quality of service to satisfy the subscription request.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajan does not disclose various recited features in claim 1, particularly as amended. For example, Applicants submit that Rajan does not disclose:

determining at least one quality of service required for presenting the at least one content resource to the user;

Applicants find that Rajan provides a user a personalized web page that includes a listing of user-subscribed Web pages (*see, e.g.*, col. 6, lines 41-59, col. 23, line 67 – col. 24, line 2). However, Rajan does not disclose determining quality of service requirements, such as a bandwidth, for presenting a content resource (*e.g.*, a streaming video) to the user, as recited in the claimed invention. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Rajan.

Applicants further submit that Rajan does not disclose:

determining that the user is authorized for access to the at least one content resource by use of the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address;

In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner's characterization of Rajan as discussed on page 3 of the August 22, 2006 Office Action is rendered moot. Specifically, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Rajan discloses the use of "authorization by, for example, user name and password." While Applicants concede that the Internet Protocol (IP) and IP addresses are well known, Applicants submit that Rajan does not teach or suggest, let alone disclose, the use of a user's IP address for determining whether the user is authorized for access to a content resource. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Rajan.

Finally, Applicants submit that Rajan does not disclose:

providing, for the user, at least one communication channel in the network with the determined at least one quality of service to satisfy the subscription request.

Applicants do not find that Rajan discloses or suggests providing a communication channel with the determined at least one quality of service to satisfy the subscription request and, for at least this reason, submit that claim 1 is patentable over Rajan.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-4 and 9-10 as presently amended, and new claims 26-29 which dependent from claim 1, are patentably distinguishable from Rajan for at

least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, these dependent claims include addition features not disclosed by Rajan.

For example, new claim 26 recites:

26. The method according to claim 1,
wherein the subscription request specifies at least one time period for presenting the at
least one content resource to the user; and
wherein providing the communication channel comprises providing the communication
channel during the specified at least one time period.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajan does not disclose receiving a subscription request that specifies a time period for presenting a content resource, and providing a communication channel during the specified time period to satisfy the subscription request.

As another example, new claim 28 recites:

28. The method according to claim 1, wherein determining the at least one quality of service comprises determining an amount of delay that can be tolerated for presenting the content resource to the user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajan does not disclose determining an amount of delay that can be tolerated (as a quality of service requirement) for presenting the content resource to the user. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-4, 9-10, and 26-29 are patentable over Rajan.

Applicants have also added independent claim 30, which recites:

30. A method for use in managing content resources i, comprising:
storing, for a user, a profile comprising the user's subscription of at least one content
resource to be presented to the user through a network and the user's preferences for
displaying the at least one content resource;
generating, based on the stored profile, a portal Web page to be presented to the user, the
portal Web page reflecting the user's subscription of the at least one content resource;
determining at least one quality of service required for presenting the at least one content
resource to the user;
providing, for the user, at least one communication channel in the network with the
determined at least one quality of service to present the at least one content resource
to the user.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Rajan does not disclose at least
the following features of claim 30:

determining at least one quality of service required for presenting the at least one content
resource to the user;
providing, for the user, at least one communication channel in the network with the
determined at least one quality of service to present the at least one content resource
to the user.

Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claim 30 is
patentable over Rajan.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 31-39 are patentable over
Rajan for at least the same reasons that independent claim 30. Hence, Applicants respectfully
request that the Examiner pass claims 30-39 to issue.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that, as described above, the cited reference does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the added claims. Applicants have provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited prior art.

Applicants strongly emphasize that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples Applicants have described herein in connection with distinguishing over the prior art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, Applicants assert that it is the combination of elements recited in each of the claims, when each claim is interpreted as a whole, which is patentable. Applicants have emphasized certain features in the amended claims as clearly not present in the cited references, as discussed above. However, Applicants do not concede that other features in the claims are found in the prior art. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, Applicants are providing examples of why the amended claims described above are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

V. Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to deposit account no. 08-0219.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to deposit account no. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory S. Discher
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,488

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-663-6042
Fax: 202-663-6363
Date: January 9, 2007